DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 148 HE 018 203

AUTHOR Wood, Peter, H.; And Others
TITLE Annual Merit Pay: One Department's Approach.
PUB DATE 27 Feb 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Preconference Workshop on Merit Pay and Faculty Evaluation (Orlando, FL, February 27, 1985) as part of the Annual Conference on Improving College and University Teaching and Administration.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Check Lists; *College Faculty; *Departments; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Merit Pay; Models; Productivity; *Rating Scales; Scholarship; Schools of Education; State Universities; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Bowling Green State University OH

ABSTRACT

Efforts since 1974 to create an acceptable merit pay system at Bowling Green State University's Department of Educational Foundations and Inquiry (EDFI) are described. Construction of the activity-point merit approach that has been used since 1980 began in 1979. Each of the 24 faculty in the EDFI department listed activities or products that they believed to represent meritorious teaching, research/scholarship, and service. After the lists were collated to yield 86 separate activities or products, faculty rated each activity from 0 to 100 points and a merit evaluation checklist was produced. A total of 4,864 points were awarded to all faculty, and these points were converted into dollar amounts when the total merit increment was allocated to the department. The points received ranged from 34 to 241, with a mean point award of 202.7. Each year, modifications were made by the department. The system has the advantages of being acceptable to the members of the department, flexible, predictable, and modifiable. Major possible disadvantages involve too great a focus on quantity and a provincialism that occurs when departmental rather than university values are incorporated into a merit system. Appended are the 1984 form with instructions and a student ratings form used by the EDFI department. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED255148

ANNUAL MERIT PAY: ONE DEPARTMENT'S APPROACH

Peter H. Wood
Jane H. Wood
Ron Partin
College of Education, Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

AE018 203

SUMMARY

Various causes led BGSU to mandate that 20% of annual salary increments -- and later 40% of any annual increments -- be reflective of meritorious performance. This paper presents: (1) a brief description of the university and one of its departments; (2) a description of six years of attempts to create an acceptable departmental merit system; (3) the description of an activity-point merit approach that has been used since 1980; and (4) examples of the 1984 merit form, of typical communications to faculty concerning results of merit determinations, and a copy of the student ratings form used by the department.

Introduction to Merit, to the University, and to the Department

Introduction

Double-digit inflation, public demands for accountability, reductions in resources and in available students, and increased litigation have combined to cause many educational institutions to focus more attention upon their procedures for evaluating and rewarding faculty. In the spring of 1974, the central administration of Bowling Green State University asked college and departmental administrators and faculty to allocate approximately 20% of the next year's

---

This paper was presented as a part of the Pre-Conference Workshop on Merit Pay and Faculty Evaluation offered in Orlando, Florida (on February 27, 1985) by the University of Florida as part of the 9th Annual Conference on Improving College and University Teaching and Administration. Dr. Ronald Partin of BGSU was the primary creator of the EDFI Merit System and described the original system in Change. Dr. Robert Reed, Dr. Robert Yonker, and Dr. Stewart Berry also were major contributors to the EDFI Merit System.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter Wood
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

administrators and faculty to allocate approximately 20% of the next year's annual increment in a way that reflected the merit of individual faculty and contract staff.

For the previous several years, annual increments (if any) tended to be some hotly-debated combination of a flat sum and a percentage of current salary. Younger faculty tended to support an equal increment for all while more highly paid faculty tended to support an increment that was a percentage of current salary. Merit was associated with promotion, tenure, and special awards.

From 1974 until 1979, the central administration supported the 20% merit position while different colleges and departments jiggled and juggled their procedures -- sometimes in an attempt to identify and reward merit and sometimes to ignore merit while seeming to acceed to administrative demands.

By the spring of 1979, the 20% (of annual increment) merit policy had been generally accepted as a fact of life. Three years later, a new President and an active Board of Trustees increased the merit proportion of the annual increment to 40%. The Faculty Senate had (after months of debate) agreed to this policy -- partly because some shared the belief that merit should be rewarded and partly because others were afraid that to disagree might permit a subsequent shift to a 60%, 80% or 100% merit policy.

The University and the Department

Bowling Green State University is located in Northwestern Ohio and includes approximately 15,000 undergraduate students, 2,000 graduate students, 740 faculty, 350 contract staff, 1000 classified staff, 6 colleges, and one branch campus. BGSU originated in 1910 as a normal school and has evolved into one of Ohio's six, public, regional universities. The University's tradition and its Academic Charter give the primary responsibility for evaluation and salary change to the faculty and chairs of the approximately 45 schools and departments. The Faculty

Senate supported this orientation in its veto of suggestions that the college deans or college-level committees be given direct control over even a small (15%) percentage of the merit-increment pool.

The Department. The Department of Educational Foundations and Inquiry (EDFI) is one of seven departments or schools in the College of Education. The EDFI Department was formed twelve years ago when a very large (100+ faculty) Department of Education was divided into four departments. The 20+ faculty teach graduate and undergraduate courses in educational and child psychology, educational testing and measurement, educational foundations, and in guidance and counseling. Upon formation, the department decided to have only one standing committee (an elected, five-person, Faculty Evaluation Committee) and to make all major decisions as a committee-of-the-whole. Four of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) are elected for staggered two-year terms and represent each professorial rank in the department. The fifth member is annually appointed by the Department Chair, and both the Department Chair and the department's representative to the College Personnel Committee serve as ex-officio, non-voting members. The FEC is responsible for recommending and implementing procedures related to annual merit increments, reappointment of probationary faculty, promotion, and recommendation for graduate faculty status. Tenure decisions are the responsibility of all tenured faculty while hiring tends to be a responsibility of each departmental subdivision.

The Trial Years

Previous to 1974, each department chair annually used a five-point scale to rate each faculty member's teaching, research and service. The ratings were stored in the Dean's files, and most faculty appeared unaware of their existence.

Spring, 1974: All Rate All. In order to meet the new request for annual merit pay, all EDFI faculty were asked to use a five-point scale to rate the

teaching, research and service of all other EDFI faculty. Each faculty member who was one-half of a standard deviation above the mean (for teaching, research and service) received an extra $100 per dimension. Anyone above this point on a composite rating received $200. The remainder of the increment was divided between a flat increase of $300 for everyone and a 2½% increase for everyone. The department subsequently voted the procedure down on the grounds that most faculty didn't know enough about their colleagues to rate them. A student ratings form was developed and its three most general questions were intended as one indicator of effective teaching. The most recent version of the form is attached.

Spring, 1975: More Input. Seven criteria were used in 1975. The Faculty Evaluation Committee independently rated all faculty on teaching, research and service; a student ratings form was employed to produce a fourth value; and all faculty were asked to rank their colleagues on teaching, research and service. Again, all faculty were provided with complete access to all personnel files. Faculty in the top 25% on any of the seven criteria received three points per criterion; those falling into the middle 50% range received two points; and those falling into the bottom quarter received one point. Consequently a "perfect" faculty member would garner 21 points, and a comparatively inactive person would receive seven points. The majority of the available increment was allocated to a 7% cost of living increase; some was used to reduce inequities and to reward those promoted; and the remainder was allocated to merit points valued at $28 each. The ranking system only asked faculty to rank the "best" seven faculty in each dimension and didn't require all to know about the work of all others. This ranking system lasted three years. The rating of the FEC was voted down after one use.

1976-1977. Chair's Opinions Added. The student ratings system and the ranking system continued, and the chair was asked to identify the most meritorious

activities performed by faculty during the year. The top nine of the student rated faculty each received $75, the top seven in peer ranked teaching received $30, and the top three (or four) in peer ranked scholarship (or service) also received $30. Each chair-determined meritorious activity was worth $40. The great majority of the increment was divided among a $420 flat increase, a 4½% increase and rewards to those promoted. The procedure remained the same in 1977, but the dollar values changed.

Spring, 1978. The department voted to award all increments as a percentage of base salary, but meritorious faculty received "Letters of Commendation" based on student ratings, peer rankings and the chair's overall evaluation.

Spring, 1980: Activity Point System = 10%. From 1980 on, all merit was awarded through use of an activity-points system that is still in use. As in the past, in 1980, the department awarded approximately 10% (or less) of the annual increment to "merit". As the point system became more familiar and the higher administration became more insistent, the full 20% was thrown into the point pool. As of this year, 40% of the total increment pool will be awarded through use of the point system.

The Activity-Points Merit System

Constraints. As merit awards became more than the awarding of certificates to a few faculty, it became very clear that no single source of information (chair ratings, committee ratings, peer rankings or ratings, student ratings, self-reports) was trusted by the majority of the department, but that departmental acceptance was a prerequisite for implementation. Two studies (Wood, 1977, 1978) tended to highlight some of the weaknesses of the department's previous merit evaluations. By 1980 a majority of the department was tenured, but few were near retirement or were likely to seek positions elsewhere. We would all be working together for quite a few years. Any merit system had to be accepted by a majority, and

ideally, had to represent the diverse interests and contributions of from 20 to 30 different people. It also was hoped that the merit system might stimulate faculty to improve performance in areas valued by themselves, by their colleagues, and by their institution.

Step One: Generating Criteria. Each of the 24 faculty (in 1979-80) were mailed a questionnaire which asked them to list activities or products that they believed to represent meritorious "teaching", "research/scholarship", and "service". At the end of two weeks, the lists were collated to yield 86 separate activities or products.

Step Two: Valuing Activities. A list of the 86 activities or products was distributed, and faculty were asked to value each activity from 0 to 100 points "assuming that a refereed journal article has a value of 20 points." Mean values were computed and rounded to the nearest whole number. Median values would have been used for extremely variable responses.

Step Three: First Use. A merit evaluation checklist was constructed and distributed to faculty. All faculty were asked to note their activities for the previous academic year and sum the resulting points. The Faculty Evaluation Committee examined the resulting forms to resolve inconsistencies and ambiguities. A total of 4,864 points were awarded to all faculty, and these points were converted into dollar amounts when the total merit increment was allocated to the department. The points received ranged from 34 to 241 with a mean point award of 202.7. Consequently, everyone received some merit money, but the most productive person received seven times as much as the lowest point gainer.

Subsequent years. During each subsequent year, various modifications were suggested by the FEC and accepted by the department. Student ratings of teaching, and the value of books and journal articles were increased in value. An open-ended or "other" category was added to each domain (teaching, research, service) to permit faculty to describe and request points for activities not listed on the

form. Some point values were modified, and some activities were added, subdivided or modified. As evidence accumulated that larger, required undergraduate courses were rated somewhat lower than graduate courses taught by the same teacher, a slight bonus was added to the ratings associated with undergraduate courses.

Advantages and Problems. The system has the advantages of acceptability, flexibility, predictability and modifiability. A recent, in-house survey of BGSU faculty indicated that EDFI faculty were more satisfied with their merit system than were faculty in other departments. They knew what activities would earn credit and that activities of interest to them would be valued -- at least to some degree. As new activities are identified and new evidence is accumulated, the forms can be modified to reflect these changes. A related advantage involves not having to depend upon the unpredictable nature and potentially demoralizing divisiveness that often is associated with chair, peer or committee ratings.

The major possible disadvantages involve: (1) too great a focus upon quantity instead of quality; and (2) a provincialism that occurs when departmental rather than university (or universal) values are incorporated into a merit system. The quality of publications, committee work or advising (Wood and Wood, 1980) could be assessed and built into the system, and various procedures have been tested or considered. However, the current decision is that the effort and introduction of subjectivity are not justifiable costs under current conditions. Books by Centra (1979), Miller (1972) and Seldin (1984) provide numerous ratings forms and suggestions for evaluating the quality of many academic activities. As more departments adopt the activity-point system, their ideas and values might be combined to transcend narrower viewpoints. Although the activity-point system was designed for use with a single department, there is nothing to prevent its use by a college, university, or group of institutions.

Postscripts

1) When we began our merit procedures, special awards for promotion (750 to associate professor, $1000 to full professor) were not standardized and were taken from the merit pool. Now the dollar amounts are standard and the money comes from a separate budget line. This change has avoided considerable irritation and a number of problems.

2) The merit-point history can be connected directly with tenure or reappointment decisions via minimal requirements, and there can be minimal requirements for merit itself. We have chosen not to employ such minimal requirements.

REFERENCES

Centra, J. A. Determining Faculty Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Partin, R.L. A case study: Evaluating faculty at Bowling Green State University, Change, April 1984, 31, 51-53.

Seldin, P. Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Wood, P. The description and evaluation of a college department's faculty rating system. AERA paper, 1977 (ED 142 128, December 1977).

Wood, P. Student and peer rating of college teaching and peer rating of research and service: Four years of departmental evaluation. AERA paper, 1978 (ED 155 218, March 1978).

Wood, P. and Wood, J. Student attitudes toward academic advisement (ED 187 183, October 1980).

D3/M

Appendix

A: Faculty Merit Reporting Form

B: Student Description of Teaching Form

C: Merit Memorandum: May 27, 1975

D: Merit Memorandum: April 4, 1984

EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND INQUIRY

Faculty Merit Reporting Form

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE MERIT ACTIVITY REPORTING FORM

Note #1 Grants: Items 8-10 must be received as a result of a competitive process, not awards that are routinely made to programs, colleges, or universities.

Note #2 Paper/Workshop Presentation: The same paper or workshop given multiple times should only be counted once in this section. Subsequent presentations are to be recorded under SERVICE, items 49-50, whichever is appropriate. You must make a professional judgement as to whether sufficient scholarly changes were made in a workshop or presentation to warrant the recording as a new item. Title changes and minor changes do not constitute a new workshop or presentation. The word formal in this section means a paper or workshop prepared in advance of the presentation and presented on some medium in publishable form for scrutiny by colleagues.

Note #3 Annual Editorial: The indicated points for items 21-25 assume a one year editing assignment; thus, if a journal is published four times per year, you receive 25 points if it is a national journal not 100 points (4x25).

Note #4 Professional Service Activities: Professional expertise applied to assist universities, colleges, school systems, departments, agencies, companies and other professional organizations. Do not include "good citizenship" activities performed in the capacity of a private citizen, such as church work, youth group leadership, charity drives and political endeavors.

Note #5 Student Evaluations: Use the mean composite of items 6, 7 and 8 on the Student Evaluation of Teaching form. Add 0.25 to the mean for all undergraduate sections for reporting on this form. Student evaluations from any six sections held during the previous calendar year may be used. Summer school and extension classes may be included as well as regular on-campus classes. (Most evaluations can be verified or retrieved in the department office, if needed).

1. Possible "double-dipping" such as the following is not permitted.

   A. Listing points in more than one category for the same activity. For example: editorial activities and reviewing manuscripts; serving on thesis committee and service to other colleges/departments.
   B. Listing points for grants and also for ensuing or consequent activites. For example, receiving a grant for a workshop and conducting the workshop.

   NOTE: The following types of activities are not considered as "double-dipping:" going to a convention and presenting a paper at the convention; attending a pre-convention workshop and attending the convention.

2. On the blank pages following each of the categories, list meritorious activities not included on the form.

3. On the last page, enter complete documentation for all activities: complete bibliographical documentation for publications and papers; course number, section number and semester for courses; dates and location of conferences; name of committee or council; name of student and title of independent studies. . . No points will be allowed for activities listed that are not documented.

4. Any faculty member on an approved leave for one or more semesters during the considered calendar year may request that the mean number of points received during the previous three years be used as the basis for merit distribution. Such a written request should be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee in lieu of this form.

5. In the event that a committee assignment straddles two calendar years, it may be counted in both.

6. The EDFI Graduate Advisory Committee consisting of all faculty holding graduate faculty status is a bona fide committee.

7. Reviewers of manuscripts for journals and/or conventions receive three points for each organization, not each manuscript.

8. Colloquia, symposia, or panel participations without a formal paper count as speeches under item 53.

9. Committee reports normally prepared by the committee chair do not count under items 17 or 18 but are included in the points awarded for chair under items 41 or 42.

10. Large fellowships such as a Fullbright are counted as national grants.

11. Serving as a guest speaker in a class is counted as service to individuals under item 51.

12. One-half time faculty should enter <u>all</u> service and <u>all</u> research activities completed during the reporting year. Teaching should be limited to the <u>three</u> (rather than six for one-half time) best course evaluations during the reporting period.

Approved for use Sept. 12, 1984
for 1984 calendar year
May 1984 Revision
Activity Reporting Form

Name_____

- -

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Publication

(1) Book, professional — No._____ @ 100 ea. = _____

(2) Book, professional (new edition) — No._____ @ 30 ea. = _____

(3) Book, professional (author of chapter) — No._____ @ 30 ea. = _____

(4) Monograph — No._____ @ 30 ea. = _____

(5) Journal article, refereed — No._____ @ 25 ea. = _____

(6) Journal article, non-refereed — No._____ @ 15 ea. = _____

(7) Media/Book review — No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

Grants (see note #1)

(8) Outside BGSU - more than $1,000 — No._____ @ 25 ea. = _____

(9) Outside BGSU - more than $1,000 (denied) — No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(10) Outside BGSU - less than $1,000 — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(11) Annual FRC Grant/Award — No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(12) Other BGSU support grants — No._____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Formal Paper or Workshop Presentation (see note #2)

(13) National — No._____ @ 15 ea. = _____

(14) Regional or State — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(15) Local — No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

Media Development

(16) Commercially distributed — No._____ @ 15 ea. = _____

Development/Evaluation Written Report

(17) In-house, college or university — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(18) Agency, school, business — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

Research/Scholarship/Fellowship Award

(19) Scholarship/Fellowship received No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(20) Special award or citation received No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

Annual Editorial Activities (see note #3)

(21) Book, professional No._____ @ 30 ea. = _____

(22) National journal No._____ @ 25 ea. = _____

(23) Regional or State journal No._____ @ 15 ea. = _____

(24) Local or University publication No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(25) Newsletter No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

Reviewer

(26) Book manuscript review for publisher No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(27) Manuscripts for journal No._____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(28) Reader for professional conference No._____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(29) Grant proposals No._____ @ 3 ea. = _____

Professional Conference or Workshops Attended

(30) National, Regional, or State No._____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(31) Local (3 hour minimum duration) No._____ @ 1 ea. = _____

(32) Local colloquium (ten maximum) No._____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Other Scholarly Activities

(32) List any other activities that you consider research or scholarship. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Research and Scholarly Activities = _____

SERVICE

Committees and Councils

(33) Department, College, University Standing	No.____	@ 4 ea. =	____
(34) Department, College, University Ad Hoc	No.____	@ 2 ea. =	____
(35) Local membership Standing	No.____	@ 4 ea. =	____
(36) Local membership Ad Hoc	No.____	@ 2 ea. =	____
(37) State or Regional Standing	No.____	@ 6 ea. =	____
(38) State or Regional Ad Hoc	No.____	@ 3 ea. =	____
(39) National Standing	No.____	@ 8 ea. =	____
(40) National Ad Hoc	No.____	@ 4 ea. =	____
(41) Committee Chair Standing	No.____	@ 2 ea. =	____
(42) Committee Chair Ad Hoc	No.____	@ 1 ea. =	____
(43) Committee Secretary	No.____	@ 1 ea. =	____
(44) Area Coordinator	No.____	@ 4 ea. =	____

Professional Service Activities (see note #4)

(45) Instructional/Program development, one time	No.____	@ 3 ea. =	____
(46) Instructional/Program development, over extended time	No.____	@ 6 ea. =	____
(47) Consulting, one time formal arrangement	No.____	@ 3 ea. =	____
(48) Consulting, over extended time formal arrangement	No.____	@ 6 ea. =	____
(49) Other services, one time	No.____	@ 3 ea. =	____
(50) Other services, over extended time	No.____	@ 6 ea. =	____
(51) Service to individuals other than students in your classes of an instructional or research nature (ten maximum)	No.____	@ 1 ea. =	____

Other Service Activities

(52) Special award or citation	No.____	@ 10 ea. =	____
(53) Speaker for local organization	No.____	@ 3 ea. =	____

(54) List any other activities that you consider to be service. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Service Activities = _____

TEACHING

Adviser

(55) 1-10 students — 4 pts. = _____

(56) 11-19 students — 6 pts. = _____

(57) 20 or more students — 8 pts. = _____

Supervision

(58) Thesis committee, completed — No._____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(59) Dissertation committee, completed — No._____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(60) Committee chair, completed — No._____ @ 4 ea. = _____

Independent Studies Supervised

(61) 1-10 students (ten maximum) — No._____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Student Evaluations (see note #5)

(62) Section mean 6.00 or greater — No._____ @ 16 ea. = _____

(63) Section mean 5.75 - 5.99 — No._____ @ 14 ea. = _____

(64) Section mean 5.50 - 5.74 — No._____ @ 12 ea. = _____

(65) Section mean 5.25 - 5.49 — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(66) Section mean 5.00 - 5.24 — No._____ @ 8 ea. = _____

(67) Section mean 4.75 - 4.99 — No._____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(68) Section mean 4.50 - 4.74 — No._____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(69) Section mean 4.25 - 4.49 — No._____ @ 2 ea. = _____

(70) Section mean 4.00 - 4.24 — No._____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Curriculum Development

(71) Course proposal implemented — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(72) Program/project coordinator — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

Other Teaching Activities

(73) Special award or citation — No._____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(74) List any other activities that you consider to be teaching. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Teaching Activities = _____

Name_____ Calendar Year _____

- -

On each of the following lines, indicate the item number and a description of each activity that you used to gain merit points on the Activity Reporting Form. Provide complete documentation when possible. For example: include course number, section number, and mean rating for each student evaluation; provide complete bibliographical documentation for books, articles, papers,...; list student names for advisees; conference date and location. Please attempt to list all activities that fall under one item number together and to order item numbers consecutively.

Item Number	Description of Activity
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

STUDENT DESCRIPTION OF TEACHING

Use these numbers to describe the instructor:

1 = Below Average
2 = Average
3 = Above Average (best 50%)
4 = Better than Most (best 30%)
5 = Superior (top 10-15%)
6 = One of the Best - Equal to any Previous Teacher
7 = The Best - Better than any Previous Teacher

Be sure to use PENCIL to mark your answer sheet.

1. SCHOLARSHIP (Has command of the subject, contrasts various points of view, discusses recent developments in the field, presents origins of ideas and concepts.)

2. ORGANIZATION/CLARITY (Explains clearly, is well prepared, presents material in an organized manner.)

3. INTERACTION WITH GROUP (Is sensitive to the reactions of the class, encourages student participation, welcomes questions and discussions.)

4. INTERACTION WITH INDIVIDUALS (Has genuine interest in students relates to students as individuals, respects students as persons, is valued for his advice.)

5. ENTHUSIASM (Seems to enjoy teaching, is a dynamic and energetic person, has an interesting style of presentation, is enthusiastic about the subject, has a sense of humor.)

6. THE INSTRUCTOR

7. THE TOTAL EXPERIENCE UNDER THE CONTROL OF THIS PERSON (Teaching, content, readings, tests, outside activities, seminars, homework,...everything that you associate with this class or lab/section/seminar/group.)

8. STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENT (The degree to which this class helped you to increase your knowledge, skills and competencies in comparison with other classes you have taken.)

Use these numbers to describe the instructor:

If not relevant, leave blank
1 = Major Improvements Needed
2 = Improvement is Needed (is mediocre now)
3 = Little Improvement is Needed (well done now)
4 = No Improvement is Needed (already great)
5 = Extraordinarily Effective Now

Grading Procedures

9. FAIRNESS (so far)
10. QUALITY OF TESTS
11. FAIRNESS IN GRADING OF ASSIGNMENTS
12. CLEAR EXPLANATION OF GRADING PROCEDURES

Teachers Ability to

13. SPEAK CLEARLY
14. LECTURE
15. STIMULATE DISCUSSION
16. MOTIVATE STUDENTS TO LEARN
17. INDIVIDUALIZE INSTRUCTION
18. INSPIRE EXCITEMENT AND INTEREST IN COURSE CONTENT
19. ASK THOUGHT-PROVOKING QUESTIONS

Activities and Materials

20. TEXTBOOKS
21. SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS
22. MOVIES AND USE OF OTHER AV DEVICES
23. EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION OF CLASSWORK AND ASSIGNMENTS

Instructor

24. SENSE OF HUMOR
25. PREPARATION FOR CLASS
26. OPENNESS TO STUDENT QUESTIONS
27. RESPECT FOR STUDENTS

Organization

28. CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES
29. CLARITY OF PRESENTATIONS
30. STRESS ON IMPORTANT AREAS
31. SUMMARIZATION OF MAJOR POINTS
32. EFFECTIVE USE OF CLASS TIME

Bowling Green State University

Department of Educational Foundations & Inquiry
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

May 27, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. David Elsass, Dean
College of Education

FROM: Robert L. Reed

RE: Rationale for Salary Increases, 1975-76

The following process was defined and approved by the Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Department of EDFI for establishing salary increases for the 1975-76 academic year.

Percentage Increase: Each faculty member received 7% of their 1974-75 base salary rounded to the nearest dollar with a minimum of $800 and a maximum of $1400.

Promotion: Each faculty member promoted to Associate and Full Professor received $750 and $1000 respectively.

Merit: Each faculty member was evaluated on three criteria (teaching, scholarly effort, service) and points were assigned as displayed in the following table:

	Top 25%	Mid 50%	Bot 25%
Student Evaluations	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
Peer Teaching	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
Peer Scholarly	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
Peer Service	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
FEC Teaching	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
FEC Scholarly	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt
FEC Service	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt

The total amount allocated to the department for merit increases was divided by the total points received to determine the amount each point was worth. Each faculty member was then awarded $18.00 for each point that they received.

Inequity: All faculty members who were promoted to Associate Professor received $158 to place their salary more in line with other faculty at the same rank.

April 4, 1984

RE: Salary Increases for next Year

The salary increase for next year is to be determined at the May 12 Board of Trustee's meeting with contracts to be distributed in late June.

The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee has reviewed your merit forms and has made their recommendation to the Dean of the College of Education relative to your merit salary increase for next year.

The number of points that you received is presented below. As soon as we know the exact dollar amounts, I will share that with you. Please see me if you have any questions.

FROM: Bob Reed

Merit Points:

Scholarship	Service	Teaching	Total
156	189	136	354
135	125	120	325
93	90	94	248
87	76	87	237
81	66	67	233
75	62	63	216
71	57	60	210
69	49	56	189
67	49	56	154
61	45	46	148
56	45	45	147
53	44	44	146
36	41	43	131
35	36	42	128
28	33	42	103
20	31	20	101
19	28	11	81
13	24	9	79
10	23	2	70
4	21	0	46

Name: _____ Total Points: _____ Percent of Merit Pool: _____